



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,622	07/20/2001	Yongxian Zeng	M00A283	2851

7590 09/10/2003

Philip H. Von Neida
Intellectual Property Dept.
The BOC Group, Inc.
100 Mountain Ave.
Murray Hill, NJ 07974

EXAMINER

STRICKLAND, JONAS N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1754

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/909,622	ZENG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jonas N. Strickland	1754

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 26-43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-411) Paper No(s).
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-162)
6) Other: **STANLEY S. GOVERNAN**
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-25 are, drawn to a partial oxidation process, classified in class 252, subclass 373.
 - II. Claims 26-33 are, drawn to a system for a partial oxidation process, classified in class 422, subclass 120.
 - III. Claims 34 and 35 are, drawn to a process for producing cyclic anhydrides, classified in class 549, subclass 231.
 - IV. Claims 36 and 37 are, drawn to a process for producing alkylene oxide, classified in class 568, subclass 398.8.
 - V. Claims 38 and 39 are, drawn to a process for producing chlorinated hydrocarbons, classified in class 562, subclass 512.2.
 - VI. Claims 40 and 41 are, drawn to a process for producing aldehydes, classified in class 549, subclass 262.
 - VII. Claims 42 and 43 are, drawn to a process for producing nitriles, classified in class 562, subclass 572.2.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
3. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP §

806.05(e)). In this case the process for the partial oxidation of at least one hydrocarbon does not require a heat exchanger as required by the apparatus.

4. Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because, Group III requires an anhydride-forming catalyst, which is not required by the process of Group I.

5. Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated because, Group I does not require the alkylene-forming catalyst, which is required in Group IV for producing alkylene oxides.

6. Inventions I and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group I does not require a chlorinated hydrocarbon forming catalyst, which is required for the production of chlorinated hydrocarbons in the process of Group V.

7. Inventions I and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In

the instant case the different inventions unrelated, because the process of Group I does not require an aldehyde-forming catalyst, which is required in Group VI for the production of aldehydes.

8. Inventions I and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group I does not require a nitrile-forming catalyst, which is required in the process of Group VII for the production of nitriles.

9. Inventions III and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus does not require an anhydride-forming catalyst as required in the process of Group III.

10. Inventions IV and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus does not require an alkylene-forming catalyst as required in the process of Group IV.

11. Inventions V and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to practice another and materially different process, which does not require a chlorinated hydrocarbon-forming catalyst as required in the process of Group V.

12. Inventions VI and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to practice another and materially different process, which does not require an aldehyde-forming catalyst, which is required in the process of Group VI.

13. Inventions VII and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus can be used to practice another and materially different process, which does not require a nitrile-forming catalyst, which is required in the process of Group VII.

14. Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group III requires a anhydride-forming catalyst for producing cyclic anhydrides, which is not required in the process of Group IV.

15. Inventions III and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group III requires a anhydride-forming catalyst for producing cyclic anhydrides, which is not required in the process of Group V.

16. Inventions III and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group III requires a anhydride-forming catalyst for producing cyclic anhydrides, which is not required in the process of Group VI.

17. Inventions III and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group III

requires a anhydride-forming catalyst for producing cyclic anhydrides, which is not required in the process of Group VII.

18. Inventions IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group IV requires a alkylene-forming catalyst for producing alkylene oxides, which is not required in the process of Group V.

19. Inventions IV and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group IV requires a alkylene-forming catalyst for producing alkylene oxides, which is not required in the process of Group VI.

20. Inventions IV and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group IV requires a alkylene-forming catalyst for producing alkylene oxides, which is not required in the process of Group VII.

21. Inventions V and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of

operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group V requires a chlorinated hydrocarbon-forming catalyst for producing chlorinated hydrocarbons, which is not required in the process of Group VI.

22. Inventions V and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group V requires a chlorinated hydrocarbon-forming catalyst for producing chlorinated hydrocarbons, which is not required in the process of Group VII.

23. Inventions VI and VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are unrelated, because the process of Group VI requires an aldehyde-forming catalyst for producing aldehydes, which is not required in the process of Group VII.

24. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

25. During a telephone conversation with Phillip H. Von Neida on 9/5/03 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-25. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 26-43 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

26. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Double Patenting

27. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

28. Claims 1-25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent No. 6,379,586 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because USP '586 claims a process for producing hydrogen and carbon monoxide by the partial oxidation of at least one hydrocarbon, by passing an oxygen-containing gas at a temperature in the temperature range of about 300 to

about 1400°C, through a reaction zone containing an oxygen-selective mixed conductor, which may be ceramic at an absolute pressure in the range of 0.5 to 50 bara, which adsorbs oxygen from the oxygen-containing gas onto the mixed conductor and passing at least one hydrocarbon through the reaction zone at a temperature in the range of about 300 to about 1400°C, thereby contacting the mixed conductor and reacting with oxygen to produce a product gas.

Conclusion

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonas N. Strickland whose telephone number is 703-306-5692. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH, 7:30-5:00, off 1st Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 703-308-3837. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-0661.


Jonas N. Strickland
September 5, 2003


STANLEY S. SILVERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700